REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 30-33, 36-41 and 43-58 are pending.

Claims 30-33, 36-41 and 43-58 stand rejected.

I. Amendments

Claims 30, 37, 40, 43-47, 53 and 54 have been amended to more particularly point out what the Applicants consider to be their invention. The amendments to the claims are supported throughout the specification. The amended claims do not contain any new matter. The claim amendments address the rejections and should advance the application to issuance.

II. Claim Rejections

In response to paragraph 3 of the office action, rejecting claims 30-33 and 36-39 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the claims are rejected for containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that at the time the application was filed, the inventors had possession of the claimed invention regarding "essentially free of catalysts." The rejection

of claims 30-33 and 36-39 is moot in light of the amendments eliminating this specific limitation.

In response to paragraph 4 of the office action, claims 30-33 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 30-33 and 36-39 are rejected over the term "essentially free of catalysts." Claims 30-33 and 36-39 are amended to remove the term "essentially free of catalysts" to more particularly point out what the Applicants consider their invention. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection in light of the amendment.

In response to paragraph 5 of the office action, claims 30-33, 36-39, 43, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement regarding the term about and NCO content. Applicants respond with amendment of claims 30-33, 36-39, 43, and 54 to comply with the contents of the specification. The rejection is moot in light of the amendments and Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejections.

In response to paragraph 6 of the office action, claims 30-33 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to provide enablement to make and use the invention with regards to stoichiometry. The Applicants traverse this rejection as broad and conclusory in light of the claim language directed toward the specific stoichiometric ratios. Applicants' respectfully request removal of the rejection, which is unsupported by the facts as clearly present in the specification. The rejection is moot in light of the amendments to the claims to more particularly point out what the Applicants consider to be their invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the rejections of claims 30-33 and 36-39.

In response to paragraph 7 of the office action, claims 30-33, 36-39, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respond to the rejection by removing the language not compliant with the written description. In light of the amendment to the claims Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 30-33, 36-39, and 54.

In response to paragraph 8 of the office action, claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 37 and 38 are rejected over the term "having an initial compression" for being unclear which compression was discussed. Claims 37 and 38 are amended to clarify that the compression value was that of the core to more particularly point out what the Applicants consider their invention. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection in light of the amendment.

Claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The use of the term "can be" is indefinite. Applicants respond through amendment of the claims to remove the indefinite term "can be". Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the rejection in light of the amendments.

In response to paragraph 10 of the office action, claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description

requirement. Applicants respond to the rejection by removing the language not compliant with the written description. In light of the amendment to the claims Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 43.

In response to paragraph 11 of the office action, rejecting claims 44-47 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the claims are rejected for containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that at the time the application was filed, the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. The rejection of claims 44-47 is moot in light of the amendments eliminating this confusing language.

In response to paragraph 12 of the office action, rejecting claims 43-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The use of the term "assembly" and "system" are confusing. Applicants respond through amendment of the claims to remove the confusing terms. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the rejection in light of the amendments.

In response to paragraph 13 of the office action, rejecting claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The use of the term "liquid" is confusing. Applicants respond through amendment of the claims to modify the confusing term. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the rejection in light of the amendment.

In response to paragraph 14 of the office action, claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respond to the rejection by changing the language considered not to be compliant with the written description. In light of the amendment to the claims Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claim 54.

In response to paragraph 15 of the office action, claims 30-33, 36-39, 43, 48-50, and 53-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to provide enablement to make and use the invention with regards to virtually any polyisocyanate. Applicants traverse this rejection as being vague, and improper

rejection unsupported by patent law. Applicants provide proper enablement of a cast golf ball formed by the reaction of a diisocyanate and a polyol by providing at least one example. The request for test results for every possible cast golf ball is not required under patent law, nor enablement standards in the art of polyurethane chemistry. In light of the above argument Applicants request removal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

In response to paragraph 16 of the office action, claims 30-33, 36-39, 44-46 and 48-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to provide enablement to make and use the invention with regards to virtually any polyisocyanate with diamine curing agent blend. Applicants traverse this rejection as being vague, and improper rejection unsupported by patent law. Applicants provide proper enablement of a cast golf ball formed by the reaction of a diisocyanate and a polyol cured with a diamine curative blend by providing at least one example. The request for test results for every possible cast golf ball is not required under patent law, nor enablement standards in the art of polyurethane chemistry.

In light of the above argument Applicants request removal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

In response to paragraph 17 of the office action, claims 30, 31, 33, 36-40, 43-51, and 53-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to provide enablement to make and use the invention with regards to virtually any polyol. Applicants traverse this rejection as being vague, and improper rejection unsupported by patent law. Applicants provide proper enablement of a cast golf ball formed by the reaction of a diisocyanate and a polyol by providing at least one example. The request for test results for every possible cast golf ball is not required under patent law, nor enablement standards in the art of polyurethane chemistry. In light of the above argument Applicants request removal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

In response to paragraph 18 of the office action, Applicants traverse the rejection of the claims 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In response to paragraph 19 of the office action, claims 30-33, 36-41, 43-52, and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al. (`852) or GB 2301291, each in view of Wu (`673) and Isaac (`568) and Presswood (`298). Applicants respectfully traverse the

rejection as improper for failing to teach each and every element as required under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). A prima facie case of obviousness is not formed and thus the Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the obviousness rejections of claims 30-33, 36-41, 43-52, and 54-58.

In response to paragraph 20 of the office action, claims 30-33, 36-41, 43-52, and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable is improper because Wu and Isaac does not disclose a polyurethane processes through casting.

In response to paragraph 21 of the office action, claims 30-33, 36-41, 43-52, and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable is improper because Presswood does not disclose a polyurethane processes through casting, nor does it disclose a diamine curative blend.

In response to paragraph 22 of the office action, claims 30-33, 36-41, 43-52, and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable is improper because Presswood in combination with Wu and Isaac does not disclose a polyurethane processes through casting, nor does it disclose a diamine curative blend.

In response to paragraph 23 of the office action, claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al (`852) or GB 2301291, each in

view of Wu (`673) and Isaac (`568) and Presswood (`298) as applied to claims 30-33, 36-41, 43-52, and 54-58 above, and further in view of Ford et al. (`280). The combination of each is improper because they do not disclose a polyurethane processes through casting, nor does it disclose a diamine curative blend.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 53 as improper for failing to teach each and every element as required under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). A prima facie case of obviousness is not formed and thus the Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the obviousness rejections.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of all rejections of claims, which are patentable over the prior art combinations and fully supported by the specification.

Please feel free to call collect with any questions regarding this submission or any matters relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark D. Lorusso
Reg. No. 41,955

Date: September 15, 2004

LORUSSO LOUD & KELLY LLP
PEASE INTERNATIONAL TRADEPORT
15 RYE STREET, SUITE 312
PORTSMOUTH, NH 03801

Tel.: (603) 427-0070
FAX: (603) 427-5530

Certificate of Mailing under 1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper along with any paper or document referred to therein as being attached or enclosed, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service to the Mail Stop Non Fee Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450- This 15th day of September, 2004.

Mark D. Lorusso